No. 84-1299

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 10 1985
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1984

RAMIRO ARANGO

vs.

THE STATE OF FLORIDA

ON APPEAL FROM AN ORDER GIVEN BY THE FLORIDA THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT BY THE APPELLANT

MIGUEL SAN PEDRO, ESQ.
Attorney for Appellant
154 Giralda Avenue
Coral Gables, Florida 33134
Telf.: (305) 448–4728

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Violation of the federal principles of due process and equal protection by the existence in Florida of a double standard of justice applied simultaneously for correcting the same conduct, the unauthorized practice of law, with dual legal forums and rules; by Florida Statute 454.23(enacted by the legislative in 1925) in the State Circuits Courts, under the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure; and since 1968 Florida Constitution, in the Florida Supreme Court, under the Rule 16 of the Florida Bar Integration Rules' Procedure.

2. Constitutionality of Florida Statute 454.23

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Statement		7
Argument:		7
I.	Reports and Opinions delivered in the Courts below	7
II.	Grounds on which the Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked	7
	a. Nature of the proceeding and the Statute pursuant to which it is brought the case to the attention of the Supreme Court of the United States	7
	b. Date of the Order sought to be reviewed	7
	c. The Statutory provisions conferring jurisdiction to this Court	8
	d. Cases sustaining this Court's Jurisdiction	8
	e. The constitutionality and validity of the Florida Statute 454.23 are involved	9
III.	The questions presented by the appeal	10
	a. Constitutionality of the Florida Statute 454.23	10
	b. Lower Court lack of Jurisdiction over the subject matter	10
	c. Violation of the federal principles of due process and equal protection	10
IV.	Statement of the case and facts	10
	a. The title of the statute is Penalities	11
	b. The conduct intended to be corrected by the statute	11
	c. Statute enacted in 1925	11

V. Grounds upon which the federal questions are substantial in this state court's case 13

APPENDED COPY OF THE ORDERS APPEALED FROM ..... 14-15..16

CONCLUSION 17
NOTICE OF APPEAL 18
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
BROAD RIVER POWER CO. v. STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ex rel. Daniel. 1930, 50 S.Ct. 101; 281 US 537	8
CORN PRODUCTS REFINING CO. v. EDDY, 1919, 39 S.Ct. 325; 249 U.S. 427; 63 L.Ed. 689	9
HENDON v. U.S., Tenn. 1943, 63 S.Ct. 608; 318 U.S. 332, rehearing denied 63 S.Ct. 1322; 319 U.S. 784; 81 L.Ed. 1727	9
MILLER v. SCHOENE, Va 1928, 48 S.Ct. 246; 276 U.S. 272; 71 L.Ed. 568	9
NEAR v. STATE OF MINNESOTA, 1931, 51 S.Ct. 625; 283 U.S. 697; 75 L.Ed. 1357	8
RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORP. v. BEAVER COUNTY, PA. 1946, 66 S.Ct. 902; 328 U.S. 204; 90 L.Ed. 1172	8
SUPREME LODGE, ETC v. KNIGHTS OF PYTHIAS OF NORTH AMERICA, ETC. 1912, 59 So.88; 102 Miss. 280	8
WINTERS v. PEOPLE OF STATE OF N.Y. N.Y. 1948, 58 S.Ct. 665; 333 U.S. 507; 92 L.Ed. 840	8
STATUTE AND RULES: Florida Statute 454.23 1968 Constitution of Florida, Art. 4, Section 15 The Florida Bar Integration Rules, Rule 16 U.S. Constitution Fourteenth Amendment U.S. Codes Title 28 Sections 1257 and 2101 to 2106	11

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER 1984

No.

RAMIRO ARANGO

v.

THE STATE OF FLORIDA

ON APPEAL TO AN ORDER GIVEN BY THE
FLORIDA 3rd DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT BY THE APPELLANT

As per Rule 15 of the Supreme Court Rules, the Appellant submits the following statement:

1. **REPORTS AND OPINIONS delivered in the Courts below:** The State Courts did not cite any opinion in this case, they decided "per curiam".

2. **Grounds on which the Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked:**

a. Nature of the proceeding and the Statute pursuant to which it is brought the case to the attention of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The U.S. Supreme Court's Appellate Jurisdiction is invoked to deal with an appeal to Florida 3rd District Court of Appeals Order referred to a case concerning violations to fourteenth Amendment of the Federal Constitution. This is the State Court of last resort for this case.

b. Date of the Order sought to the be reviewed.

The Florida Third District Court of Appeals by order dated August 14th, 1984 affirmed per curiam the Florida 11th Circuit Court's Order dated on the 9th of July 1984 denying

the Motion for post conviction relief pursuant to Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure 3,850.

A rehearing was requested by the Appellant and the Florida Third District Court of Appeals denied it on September 12th, 1984.

Notice of appeal was filed on October 11th, 1984 invoking the U.S. Supreme Court's jurisdiction.

c. The Statutory provisions conferring jurisdiction to this Court: Title 28 USC Sections 1257 and 2101 to 2106.

d. Cases sustaining this Court's Jurisdiction:

Whether state court denied to rights asserted under local law protection guaranteed by Federal Constitution is question on which United States Supreme Court's judgment may be invoked. Broad River Power Co. v. State of South Carolina ex rel. Daniel, 1930, 50 S.Ct. 401, 281 US. 537, 74 L.Ed. 1023, rehearing affirmed 51 S.Ct. 94, 282 U.S. 187, 75 L.Ed. 287.

Supreme Court, in passing on constitutional questions, regards substance, and statute attacked must be tested by operation and effect. Near v. State of Minnesota, 1931, 51 S.Ct. 625, 283 U.S. 697, 78 L.Ed. 1357.

The Supreme Court had jurisdiction of appeal from highest state court, where appeal challenged validity of state statute and raised a substantial federal question as to whether state statute conflicted with federal statute. Reconstruction Finance Corp. v. Beaver County, Pa. 1946, 66 S. Ct. 992, 328 U.S. 204, 90 L. Ed. 1172.

Where highest court of state determined that state statute did not violate U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 14, 1. United State Supreme Court had jurisdiction of appeal. Winters v. People of State of N.Y. N.Y. 1948, 68 S.Ct. 665, 333 U.S. 507, 92 L.Ed. 840.

The scope of a habeas corpus proceeding brought in a state court by one convicted in the courts of such state is a state and not a federal question, and where the state court treated the proceeding as properly raising issues of federal constitutional rights, United States Supreme

Court has jurisdiction and such issues are open there. Herndon v Lowry, Ga. 1937, 57 S.Ct. 732, 301 U.S. 242, 81L.Ed. 1066.

Where state statute was challenged in state court under due process clause of U.S.C.A.Const. Amend. 14 case was properly before Supreme Court on writ of error. Miller v. Schoene, Va. 1928, 48 S.Ct. 246, 276 U.S. 272, 72 L.Ed. 568.

In reviewing the judgment of a state court in a case in which it was unsuccessfully contended that a state law deprived a party of rights secured by the Federal Constitution, the Federal Supreme Court is concerned not with the characterization or construction of the state law by the state court, nor even with the question whether it has in terms been construed, but solely with the effect and operation of the law as put in force by the state. Corn Products Refining Co. v. Eddy, 1919, 39 S.Ct. 325, 249 U.S. 427, 63 L.Ed. 689.

The power of the United States Supreme Court to undo conviction in state courts is limited to the enforcement of those fundamental principles of liberty and justice which are secured by U.S.C.A.Const. Amend. 14. McNabb v. U.S., Tenn. 1943, 63 S.Ct. 608, 318 U.S. 322, 87 L.Ed. 819, rehearing denied 63 S.Ct. 1322, 319 U.S. 784, 87 L.Ed. 1727.

Where a right is claimed in a state court arising under a statute of the United States, a question is presented reviewable by the Supreme Court of the United States, Supreme Lodge, etc. v. Knights of Pythias of North America etc., 1912, 59 So. 88, 102 Miss. 280.

e. The constitutionality and validity of the Florida Statute 454.23 are involved. Its text is as follows:

Penalties: Any person not licensed or otherwise authorized by the Supreme Court of Florida who shall practice law or assume or hold himself out to the public as qualified to practice law in this state, or who wilfully pretends to be, or wilfully takes or uses any name, title, addition or description implying that he is qualified, or recognized by law as qualified to act as a lawyer in this

state, and any person entitled to practice who shall violate any provision of this chapter, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor of the first degree, punishable as provided in F.S.775.083.

Article 5, Sec. 15, Florida Constitution, grants exclusive jurisdiction in the Supreme Court to regulate the admission of persons to the practice of law and provides as follows:

> The Supreme Court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to regulate the admission of persons to the practice of law and discipline of persons admitted. (*id*)

3. The questions presented by the appeal:

a) Constitutionality of the Florida Statute 454.23
b) Lower Court lack of Jurisdiction over the subject matter. Collateral attack to the sentencing.
c) Violation of the federal principles of due process and equal protection by the existence in Florida of a double standard of justice applied simultaneously for correcting the same conduct, the unauthorized practice of law, with dual legal forums, in the State Circuit Courts, and since 1968 Florida Constitution, with the "sole exclusive" forum of the Florida Supreme Court.

4. STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

The Appellant in this case is an American citizen of Cuban origin, member of a group of Cuban-Americans residents in Florida who were practicing attorneys in Cuba and applied to get their license to practice in Florida through an official program created by an Order given by the Supreme Court of Florida in 1973, creating a "Cuban American Lawyers Institute" (CALI) as a way for satisfying a "public welfare need" of the numerous Cuban tax payer community in Florida, offering to the CALI applicants two years of intensive common law studies at Miami or Gainesville Universities and the possibility of earning their Florida license through a bar exam. The appellant earns his livelihood doing paralegal works for several licensed attorneys while he waits to get his license to practice.

The Florida Bar started proceedings in the Supreme Court of Florida as per 1968 Florida Constitution to prosecute the Appellant under Rule 16 of the Florida Bar Integration. Rules for "unauthorized practice of Law". The Florida Constitution make an exclusive province of the Supreme Court the regulation of the practice of law in the state.

Simultaneously, as a parallel prosecution to correct the same conduct, the State of Florida charged the Appellant with a violation of Florida Statute 454.23 (enacted in 1925) for the misdemeanor of "unauthorized practice of law", in the Eleventh Circuit Court of Florida, in and for Dade County, he was found guilty and sentenced with the maximum sentencing for said misdemeanor of 364 days in jail.

This judgment was appealed to the Florida Third District Court of Appeals and affirmed per curian **without any opinion.**

The plaintiff's attorney presented a motion for mitigation and a State Habeas Corpus to the Lower Court (Fla. 11th Circuit) based on the unconstitutionality and lack of jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Lower Court because since the new Florida Constitution of 1968 the regulation of the practice of law is the exclusive province of the Florida Supreme Court. The F.S. 454.23 is obsolete (1925) and superseaded by the new Constitution and rules and procedures enacted by the Supreme Court for the correction of the unauthorized practice of law through the Florida Bar Committee for prosecuting the Unauthorized Practice of Law. The breach to federal principles of due process and equal protection were raised by the habeas corpus. Both, the motion and the State Habeas Corpus were denied by the Lower Court **without opinion.**

Following the Florida Constitutional principle (Article 5 section 15, Fla. Const. 1968) that the supreme Court of Florida is the only one with jurisdiction to regulate the practice of law and correct the unauthorized practice in the State, (Integration Rules of the Florida Bar Rule 16) the Plaintiff's attorney submitted the same State Habeas Corpus raising the breach to the federal principles to the Supreme Court of Florida, challenging the constitutionality and validity of the F.S. 454.23. The Florida Supreme Court denied the Habeas Corpus Petition **without opinion.**

The Plaintiff filed with the Lower State Court (11th Circuit) a post conviction remedy motion under Rule 3.850 to vacate the sentencing, raising the breach to the federal principles of due process and equal protection and alleged:

> Lack of jurisdiction over the subject matter of the State Lower Court because of the unconstitutionality of the F.S. 454.23 grounding the charges making the sentencing against the Plaintiff/Petitioner a nullity and void.
>
> F.S. 454.23 constitutionality was challenged on the following grounds:

The title of the statute is "Penalties" not giving a fair idea or reasonable indication of the general subject of the Statute.

b. The conduct intended to be corrected by the statute, "the practice of law without license" is not defined, breaking the constitutional principle of giving knowledge for the best understanding of the citizens of the conduct to be corrected by the Statute. The Statute is vague.

c. This Statute was enacted in 1925 when the Florida Bar did not exist, nearly 60 years ago. About 25 years later the Bar integration rules were enacted and in 1968 the new Florida Constitution decided to make the practice of law the exclusive province of the Supreme Court of Florida superseading the F.S. 454.23 enacted by the legislative, repealing it by implication, for inconsistency with the new State Constitution, and the new Integration Rules of the Florida Bar, Rule 16.

The Florida Supreme Court created the Florida Bar "unauthorized practice of law Committee" with special procedure for prosecuting exclusively the correction of the conduct referred to in F.S. 454.23, making unapplicable the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure for those special cases.

The F.S. 454.23 goes against the State and Federal principles of due process and equal protection of the Laws. Under the present circumstances would be to maintain a double standard of justice with a dual system to correct the same conduct, by the Supreme Court and the obsolete type of correction given by the 1925 statute.

The Plaintiff/ Petitioner has been simultaneously submitted to both procedures for correcting the same conduct.

(EXHIBIT A) which is the most outrageous offense against the federal principles of due process and equal protection.

The Plaintiff's Motion under the Rule 3.850 was denied by the 11th Circuit Court. The Plaintiff appealed to the Florida Third District Court of Appeals and the Lower Court's decision was affirmed per curiam without any opinion.

The appellant filed a motion for rehearing grounded in the same arguments of this appeal, and it was also denied by the Florida Third District court, without any opinion.

The Third District Court of Appeals is the last available State forum to hear appeals on the case. The U.S. Supreme Court's Jurisdiction is the next legal forum to apply for remedy.

5. GROUNDS UPON WHICH THE FEDERAL QUESTIONS ARE SUBSTANTIAL IN THIS STATE COURT'S CASE

The Federal Courts never dealt before with the existence in Florida of a dual legal system running parallel and applied concurrently, as in the Appellant's case, for correcting the "unauthorized practice of law" conduct.

In 1925 the Florida legislature enacted the Statute 454.23. Prosecutions for violations under said Statute followed the Florida Rules for Criminal Procedure.

In 1968 the new Florida Constitution (Art. 5, section 15) gave to the State Supreme Court the exclusive province for regulating the practice of law in the State, and by the Florida Bar Integration Rules, Rule 16, the new procedure was given for correcting the unauthorized conduct in exclusion of the Florida Rules for Criminal Procedure.

This latter system superseaded by implication the 1925 Statute. Nevertheless the Florida Courts continue to apply both systems concurrently in breach of the federal due process and equal protection principles of the Fourteenth Amendment.

APPENDED COPY OF THE ORDERS APPEALED FROM

IN THE FLORIDA SUPREME COURT
OF FLORIDA

March 8, 1984

THE FLORIDA BAR Petitioner	**	
vs.	**	CASE NO. 62,075
RAMIRO ARANGO Respondent.	**	AMENDED SUPLEMENTAL REPORT

Pursuant to the order of the Supreme Court of Florida, Tuesday, September 20, 1985, the undersigned referee in this cause hereby submits this amended report.

The Referee adopts all Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommendations previously stated by the Referee's report of March 25, 1983, and further orders:

That Respondent RAMIRO ARANGO be found and adjudicated guilty of indirect criminal contempt.

The Referee further recommends the Respondent be sanctioned and punished by the levying of a fine of $2,500 and imprisonment for 5 months pursuant to the Courts authority in Integration Rule, Article XVI, (III)(B)(2).

DONE and ORDERED at DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, this 8th day of March, 1984.

ROBERT P. KAYE, REFEREE

EXHIBIT A 14.

NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES
TO FILE REHEARING MOTION
AND, IF FILED, DISPOSED OF.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
OF FLORIDA
THIRS DISTRICT
JULY TERM, A.D. 1984

RAMIRO ARANGO, **

vs.
THE STATE OF FLORIDA, ** CASE NO. 84–1744
**
Appellee. **

Opinion filed August 14, 1984

An Appeal under Fla. R.App.P. 9.140 (q) from the Circuit Court for Dade County, Theodore G. Mastos, Judge.

Miguel San Pedro, for appellant.

Jim Smith, Attorney General, for appellee.

Before SCHWARTZ, C.J. and BANKDULL and JORGENSON, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Affirmed.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL

OF FLORIDA

THIRD DISTRICT

JULY TERM, A.D., 1984

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1984

RAMIRO ARANGO Appellant.	**	
vs.	**	CASE NO. 84–1744
STATE OF FLORIDA Appellee.	**	

Upon consideration, appellant a motion for rehearing is hereby denied.

A True Copy
ATTEST:
LOUIS J. SPALLOWE
Appeal, Third District

By_____
Deputy Clerk

cc: Miguel San Pedro
Jim Smith

/lb

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES ON APPEAL FROM A FLORIDA THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS' FINAL ORDER

Florida 3rd D.C.A. CASE No. 84–174

CRIMINAL DIVISION

RAMIRO ARANGO
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF FLORIDA
Appellee.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

RAMIRO ARANGO,
Appellant,
vs.
THE STATE OF FLORIDA,
Appellee.

COMES NOW the Appellant and give notice of appeal invoking the Supreme Court of the United States Jurisdiction on Appeal to a Final Order dated on the 14th of August, 1984, rehearing denied on the 12th of September, 1984, given by the Florida Third District Court on Appeals, a State Court of last resort, in its criminal case No. 84-1744.

The Appellant invokes the Supreme Court of the United Stated Jurisdiction grounded on breaches to the Federal Constitution Fourteenth Amendment, with violation to the due process principle by applying in a criminal case a Florida State unconstitutional statute and violation of the equal protection of the laws by applying in Florida a dual system of justice to correct the same unauthorized conduct.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy was mailed on the 11th day of October, 1984 to the State Attorney's Office at the Dade County Metro Justice Bldg., 1351 N.W. 12 Street, Miami, Florida.

I further certify that all parties in interest in the case were duly served.

MIGUEL SAN PEDRO, Esq.
4200 S.W. 3rd Street
Miami, Florida 33134
Telephone: 441-2395

CONCLUSION

The Supreme Court of the United States should take Jurisdiction and know the case on the merits.

Respectfully submitted.

MIGUEL SAN PEDRO, ESQ.
Attorney for Appellant
4200 S.W. 3rd Street
Miami, Florida 33134
TELF.: (305) 448-4728

October 1984

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, hereby certify that three copies were mailed on **February 11, 1985 to the** Florida State Attorney's office at Dade County Metro Justice Bldg., 1351 NW 12 Street, Miami, Florida.

Miguel San Pedro
Attorney for Appellant
4200 S.W. 3rd. Street
Miami, Fla. 33134
Tel. 305-448-4728

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAY 2 1985
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

No. 84-1299

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1984

RAMIRO ARANGO

vs.

THE STATE OF FLORIDA

ON APPEAL FROM AN ORDER GIVEN BY THE FLORIDA THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS

REHEARING ON THE JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT BY THE APPELLANT

MIGUEL SAN PEDRO, ESQ.
Attorney for Appellant
154 Giralda Avenue
Coral Gables, Florida 33134
Telf: (305) 448-4728

CERTIFICATE

Miguel San Pedro, attorney for Petitioner herein hereby certify that this Petition for Rehearing is restricted to the review of violations of the Petitioners' Constitutional guarantees of due process and equal protection of the laws as enumerated by the fifth and fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution both prior to and after judgment had been taken against them.

This petition for Rehearing is presented in good faith and not for purposes of delay, but only so justice may be done.

MIGUEL SAN PEDRO, ESQ.
154 Giralda Ave.
Coral Gables, Florida 33134
Telephone: 305-4484728

Subscribed and sworn to before me, at Miami, Florida, this 2nd day of May, 1985.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. The State Jurisdiction in this case was exhausted.

2. The violation to the federal principles of due process and equal protection of the laws was brought to the attention of the state courts.

3. The violation of the federal principles of due process and equal protection of the laws comes from the present enforcement of Florida Statute 454.23 impliedly superseaded by Art. 5 Section 15 of 1968 Florida Constitution.

4. Florida Statute 454.23 by itself is against the federal principle of due process, for vagueness and lack of proper title.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Good Faith Certificate 1
Table of Authorities 4
I. The State Remedies are Exhausted. 6
II. The violation of Federal Principles was clearly invoked at the State Jurisdiction. 6
III. Nature of the violation to the Federal Principles 6
IV. A similar case was never entertained by this Jurisdiction 7
V. Statutory Jurisdiction conferring Jurisdiction to this Court 7
VI. Cases sustaining this Court's Jurisdiction. 8

CONCLUSION 10

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE. 11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

BROAD RIVER POWER CO. v. STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ex rel. Daniel 1930, 50 S.Ct. 101, 281 US 537 8

CORN PRODUCTS REFINING CO. v. EDDY, 1919 39 S.Ct. 325, 249 U.S. 427, 63 L.Ed. 689 8

HERNDON v. LOWRY GA 1937, 57 S.Ct 732, 301 US 242, 81 L.Ed. 1066. 8

MC NABB v US Tenn. 1943, 63 S.Ct. 608, 318 US 322, 87 L.Ed. 819, rehearing denied 63 S. Ct. 1322, 319 US 784. 87 L.Ed. 1727 9

MILLER v. SCHOENE, Va 1928, 48 S.Ct. 246, 276 U.S. 272, 71 L. Ed. 568 8

NEAR v. STATE OF MINNESOTA, 1931, 51 S. Ct. 625, 283 U.S. 697, 75 L. Ed. 1357 8

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORP. v. BEAVER COUNTY, PA. 1946, 66 S. Ct. 902; 328 U.S. 204; 90 L. Ed. 1172 8

SUPREME LODGE, ETC v. KNIGHTS OF PYTHIAS OF NORTH AMERICA, ETC.
1912, 59 So. 88; 102 Miss. 280 9

WINTERS v. PEOPLE OF STATE OF N.Y. N.Y.
1948, 58 S. Ct. 665; 333 U.S. 507; 92 L.Ed.840 8

STATUTE AND RULES:
Florida Statute 454.23
1968 Constitution of Florida, Art. 4, Section 15
The Florida Bar Integration Rules, Art. 16
U.S. Constitution Fourteenth Amendment
U.S. Codes Title 28 Sections 1257 and 2101 to 2106

COMES NOW the Appellant and moves this Honorable Court for a Rehearing reconsidering its denial of Jurisdiction grounding its petition as follows:

I. The State remedies are exhausted:

The Florida 11th Circuit Court sentence was appealled to the Florida 3rd District Court of Appeals that affirmed "per curiam" without opinion the Lower Court sentencing.

The Appellant presented to the Lower Court a motion under the Rule 3.850 (Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure) for post conviction relief that was denied. This denial was appealled to the Florida 3rd District Court and also affirmed "per curiam" without opinion.

The Florida Third Disctrict Court of Appeals is the State Court of last resort for the case, the U.S. Supreme Court's Appellate Jurisdiction is properly invoked to deal with this Appeal.

II. The violation to Federal principles was clearly invoked at the State Jurisdiction.

At Appellant's motion in the Florida 11th Circuit Court for post conviction relief under FRCP, Rule 3.850 and later in the Appeal to the Florida 3rd Dictrict Court of Appeals the violation to the Federal principles of due process and equal protection of the laws was clearly alleged grounding the next step in search of relief invoking the jurisdiction of this U.S. Supreme Court.

III. Nature of the violation to the federal principles:

1) The "unauthorized practice of law" conduct is corrected in the State of Florida by two different and contradictory legal systems:

a) One created by the legislative in 1925 with the Florida Statute 454.23.

In this statute the violation was considered a misdemeanor of the first degree punishable as provided in F.S. 775.082 and 775.083 with a maximum of one year imprisonment.

The criminal procedure to be followed was given by the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure and the legal forums to know the cases were the State Courts.

b) In 1968 the new Florida Constitution was enacted and by its Art. 5 section 15 the regulation of the practice of law

was considered the exclusive province of the Florida Supreme Court.

By this disposition impliedly the F.S. 454.23 was superseaded as done by the legislative. Impliedly a new system was born under the Florida Supreme Court, constitutionally repealling the old one, for inconsistency with the new State Constitution. The Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure were also repealed for the referred correction and the Florida Supreme Court enacted the Rule 16 of the Florida Bar Integration Rules and created its "Unauthorized Practice of Law Committee" dealing with all matters concerning the unauthorized conduct and procedure for its correction. From this moment the exclusive forum to know about these corrections was the State Supreme Court.

The violation to the Federal due process and equal protection of the laws came from the fact that both legal systems for identical correction were left effective to be applied together and simultaneously and the Courts did not exclude the old system created by the legislative with the F.S. 454.23 as was the clear itention of the 1968 Florida Constitution.

2. The Florida Statute 454.23 violates also the federal principles of due process and equal protection of the laws as follows:

a) The title of the statute is "Penalties" not giving a fair idea or reasonable indication of the general subject of the Statute. b) The Conduct intended to be corrected by the statute, the "practice of law without license" is not defined, breaking the Constitutional principle of giving knowledge for the best understanding of the citizens of the Conduct to be corrected by the Statute, c) The statute is vague. This Statute was enected in 1925 when The Florida Bar did not exist, nearly 60 years ago.

IV. A similar case was never entertained by this Jurisdiction and it is in the best interest of Justice to clarify and decide the uncongruencies of the existing situation.

The State Courts decided this case all the way without giving any opinion at any stage of their jurisdiction.

Our Federal system and the principles of federalism provided this Honorable Court's jurisdiction to assist the citizens in cases like the present one where the State Jurisdiction imposes arbitrarily penalties to the citizens in violation of the federal principles of due process and equal protection of the laws.

V. The Statutory provisions conferring jurisdiction to this Court: Title 28 USC Sections 1257 and 2101 to 2106.

VI. Cases sustaining this Court's Jurisdiction:

Whether state court denied to rights asserted under local law protection guaranteed by Federal Constitution is question on which United States Supreme Court's judgment may be invoked. Broad River Power Co. v. State of South Carolina ex rel. Daniel, 1930, 50 S.Ct. 401, 281 US. 537, 74 L. Ed. 1023, rehearing afrirmed 51 S.Ct. 94,282 U.S. 187,75 L. Ed. 287.

Supreme Court, in passing on constitutional questions, regards substance, and statute attacked must be tested by operation and effect. Near v. State of Minnesota, 1831,51 S.Ct. 625,283 U.S. 697,78 L.Ed. 1357.

The Supreme Court had jurisdiction of appeal from highest state court, where appeal challenged validity of state statute and raised a substantial federal question as to whether state statute conflicted with federal statute. Reconstruction Finance Corp. v. Beaver County, Pa. 1946,66 S.Ct. 992,328 U.S. 204,90 L. Ed. 1172.

Where highest court of state determined that state statute did not violate U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 14,1. United States Supreme Court had jurisdiction on appeal. Winters v. People of State of N.Y. N.Y. 1948, 68 S.Ct. 556,333 U.S. 507,92 L.Ed. 840.

The scope of a habeas corpus proceeding brought in a state court by one convicted in the courts of such state is a state and not a federal question, and where the state court treated the proceeding as properly raising issues of federal constitutional rights, United States Supreme Court has jurisdiction and such issues are open there. Herndon v Lowry, Ga. 1937, 57 S. Ct. 732, 301 U.S. 242,81 L. Ed. 1066.

Where state statute was challenged in state court under due process clause of U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 14 case was properly before Supreme Court on writ of error. Miller v. Schoene, Va. 1928, 48 S.Ct. 246,276 U.S. 272, 72 L. Ed. 568.

In reviewing the judgement of a state court in a case in which it was unsuccessfully contended that a state law deprived a party of rights secured by the Federal Constitution the Federal Supreme Court is concerned not with the characterization or construction of the state law by the state court, nor even with the question whether it has in terms been construed, but solely with the effect and operation of the law as put in

force by the state. Corn Product Refining Co. v. Eddy, 1919, 39 S.Ct. 325, 249 U.S. 427,63 L. Ed. 689.

The power of the United States Supreme Court to undo conviction in state courts is limited to the enforcement of those fundamental principles of liberty and justice which are secured by U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 14. McNabb v. U.S., Tenn. 1943,63 S.Ct. 608, 318 U.S. 322,87 L.Ed. 819, rehearing denied 63 S.Ct. 1322, 319 U.S. 784,87 L.Ed. 1727.

Where a right is claimed in a state court arising under a statute of the United States, a question is presented reviewable by the Supreme Court of the United States, Supreme Lodge, etc. v. Knights of Pythias of North America etc., 1912, 59 So. 88, 102 Miss 280.

CONCLUSION

This Honorable Court must take Jurisdiction over this case and deal with it on the merits.

MIGUEL SAN PEDRO, ESQ.
154 Giralda Avenue
Miami, Florida 33134
Telephone: 305-448-4728

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, hereby certify that theree copies were mailed on May 2nd 1985 to the Florida State Attorney's office at Dade County Metro Justice Bldg. 1351 N.W. 12 Street, Miami, Florida.

MIGUEL SAN PEDRO
Attorney for Appellant
154 Giralda Ave
Coral Gables Fla. 33134
Tel: 305-448-4728